

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed August 8, 2008, claims 1-9 were rejected. In response, Applicant has added claims 10-20 and has filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the added claims, the RCE, and the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0128768A1, hereinafter Nakano). Additionally, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Park et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,847,889, hereinafter Park). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Nakano and Park for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

“An arrangement for navigation to predetermined destinations within a search area, which is divided up by means of a linear system of coordinates into coordinate fields, wherein, by means of automatic positioning at predetermined time intervals, that coordinate field is determined in which the arrangement is situated, wherein a database is provided which contains for each coordinate field of the search area a data record with a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination, wherein the arrangement displays from the database to a user, who has input one of the predetermined destinations into the arrangement, the description of each new coordinate field as it is reached and the description of the next coordinate field provided for reaching the destination.” (emphasis added).

Nakano does not disclose that “a database is provided which contains for each coordinate field of the search area a data record with a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination,” as recited in claim 1.

Nakano discloses that guide records are provided for guide points, see paragraph [0098]. Nakano also discloses that a guide point is a point required for route guidance and a point that is located on a route from the starting point to the destination point, see paragraph [0084]. Nakano further discloses that a guide point may be an intersection where the name of the road is changed or an intersection where the direction of travel is

changed more than a predetermined angle, see paragraph [0084]. Nakano also discloses that guide points are not restricted to the above two types of intersections, but may be any point according to the intentions of the designer, for example, intersections where drivers practically often make a mistake in deciding which way to go, see paragraphs [0084] and [0132]. That is, Nakano discloses that guide points are a limited set of points that are relevant to route guidance. For example, Nakano does not disclose that guide records are provided in some areas of FIGs. 13-15, where there are no guide points. While Nakano discloses that guide records are provided for the guide points, Nakano does not disclose that the guide points include each coordinate field of a search area. Because Nakano does not disclose that the guide points include each coordinate field of a search area, Nakano does not disclose that a guide record is provided for each coordinate field of a search area.

Nakano also discloses that a data structure of traveled path information is transmitted from a terminal (1) to a center station (2), see Fig. 19 and paragraph [0144]. In particular, Nakano discloses that traveled path information (LDATA) includes L pieces of path data (LOC1) to (LOCL), where each piece of path data (LOCi) includes a longitude coordinate (LLON) and a latitude coordinate (LLAT) where LLON and LLAT represent coordinates of a point actually traveled by a vehicle. Although Nakano discloses transmitting coordinate information related to points actually travelled by a vehicle, Nakano does not disclose that points actually traveled by a vehicle include each coordinate field of a search area. Because the points actually traveled by a vehicle do not include each coordinate field of a search area, Nakano does not disclose that “a database is provided which contains for each coordinate field of the search area a data record with a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination,” as recited in claim 1.

Because Nakano does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Nakano.

Dependent Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

New Claims 10-20

Applicant has added new claims 10-20. Support for new claims 10-20 can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 6 lines 18-24 and original claims 1-9.

Independent Claim 10

Applicant has added new claim 10, which includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 3. Claim 10 recites:

“An arrangement for navigation to predetermined destinations within a search area, which is divided up by means of a linear system of coordinates into coordinate fields, wherein, by means of automatic positioning at predetermined time intervals, that coordinate field is determined in which the arrangement is situated, wherein a database is provided which contains for each coordinate field a data record with a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination, wherein the arrangement displays from the database to a user, who has input one of the predetermined destinations into the arrangement, the description of each new coordinate field as it is reached and the description of the next coordinate field provided for reaching the destination, characterized in that the coordinate system comprises a linear system of coordinates with x, y coordinates which divides the search area into coordinate fields of 50 meters by 50 meters.” (emphasis added).

Nakano discloses that a terminal (1) sets the longitudes and latitudes of a current position of a vehicle and sets a destination point for route search, see paragraphs [0105] and [0106]. Nakano also discloses that longitude and latitude coordinates represent the absolute position of a vehicle on the earth, see paragraph [0123]. However, Nakano does not disclose that the longitude and latitude coordinates divide an area, in particular the earth, into “coordinate fields of 50 meters by 50 meters” as recited in new claim 10. Because Nakano does not disclose all of the limitations of new claim 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that new claim 10 is not anticipated by Nakano.

Because claim 3 includes similar limitations to new claim 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above remarks also apply to claim 3.

Dependent Claims 11-16

Applicant has added new claims 11-16. Support for new claims 11-16 can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, original claims 2, 4-5, and 8-9.

Claims 11-16 are dependent on claim 10. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11-16 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

Independent Claim 17

Applicant has added new claim 17. Support for new claim 17 can be found in Applicant's specification at, for example, page 6 lines 18-24 and original claims 1 and 9. New claim 17 does not include the limitation "a user of the arrangement may record in the database data records for additional, personal destinations" of original claim 9. Claim 17 recites:

"An arrangement for navigation to predetermined destinations within a search area, which is divided up by means of a linear system of coordinates into coordinate fields, wherein, by means of automatic positioning at predetermined time intervals, that coordinate field is determined in which the arrangement is situated, wherein a database is provided which contains for each coordinate field a data record with a description of the current coordinate field and a description of the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination, wherein the arrangement displays from the database to a user, who has input one of the predetermined destinations into the arrangement, the description of each new coordinate field as it is reached and the description of the next coordinate field provided for reaching the destination, characterized in that the user of the arrangement may enter him/herself in the data records descriptions for the current coordinate field and the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination." (emphasis added).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Park. Park teaches that a user can set a destination by the name of a facility, a local category, a province, a phone number, and a 2-D (latitude and longitude) coordinate by voice or by characters, see column 5 lines 62-65. Park also teaches that a user interface (1110) serves as an input portion for receiving a user request related to setting a navigation mode and to setting a starting point and an ending point in a navigation mode, see column 10 lines 59-62. Park also teaches that a destination can be initially set by selecting appropriate items in pre-classified categories such as broad destination classes, narrower destination sub-classes, and specific destinations or by directly entering a destination name after a specific local area is selected, see column 17 lines 9-14. While Park teaches that a user can set a destination, a navigation mode, a starting point, and an ending point, Park does not teach that a user "enters him/herself in the data records descriptions for the current coordinate field and the next coordinate field to be located in

order to reach the destination,” as recited in new claim 17. Because Nakano and Park do not teach all of the limitations of new claim 17, Applicant respectfully asserts that new claim 17 is patentable over Nakano and Park.

Because claim 9 includes similar limitations to new claim 17, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above remarks also apply to claim 9.

Dependent Claims 18-19

Applicant has added new claims 18-19. Support for new claims 18-19 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claims 2-4. Claims 18-19 are dependent on claim 17. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18-19 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17.

Dependent Claim 20

Applicant has added new claim 20. Support for new claim 20 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 2 lines 27-30, page 6 lines 10-12, and original claim 1. Claim 20 is dependent on claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 20 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 20 is further allowable because Nakano and Park do not disclose that “a navigation route is directly displayed from the results of the means of automatic positioning and the database data records already present without the arrangement calculating the navigation route,” as recited in new claim 20. Because Nakano and Park do not teach all of the limitations of new claim 20, Applicant respectfully asserts that new claim 20 is patentable over Nakano and Park.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the added claims, the RCE, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 4, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111